



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/674,073	10/26/2000	Martin John Ellis	36-1372	1461
7590	09/28/2005		EXAMINER	
Nixon & Vanderhye 8th Floor 1100 North Glebe Road Arlington, VA 22201-4714			EL HADY, NABIL M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2152	

DATE MAILED: 09/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/674,073	ELLIS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nabil M. El-Hady	2152	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 July 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 20-61 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 20-61 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

1. Claims 20-61 are presented for examination.
2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
3. Claims 20-26, 30, 31, 40-42, 48, 49, 51, 53, 57-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yates et al. (US 6,330,586) (hereinafter Yates).
4. As per claims 20, 51, and 53, Yates teaches a communications system comprising a plurality of client side and server side computing elements, each computing element supported by a distributed processing environment whereby distributed software objects in different physical parts of the system interact by passing messages via data communications links, the communications system including service generic code and service specific code, which is distributed between said plurality of computing elements during a service session, wherein the service generic code supports a plurality of differing types of service during a service session, said service generic code when in use comprising: a session manager which performs functions generic to said plurality of differing types of service during service sessions (e.g. col. 11, lines 49-55); wherein for each type of said differing types of service, said session manager is arranged during a service session in which a plurality of participants participate, to generate event messages, each event message indicating at least one discrete change which has just occurred in the session-related status of an individual user of the session without any historical data, and to transmit said event messages to an event handler for processing (e.g. col. 11, lines 38-45).

5. As per claim 40, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
6. As per claim 58, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
7. As per claim 59, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
8. As per claim 41, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
9. As per claim 42, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
10. As per claim 48, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
11. As per claim 49, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
12. As per claim 60, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
13. As per claim 57, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
14. As per claim 21, Yates teaches the communications system wherein the computing elements include: a retailer server (e.g. Figure 1); a plurality of third party servers, each third party server being arranged to have access to a data base for the storage and retrieval of service related data (e.g. Figure 1); and a plurality of user terminals connected to the retailer server via a data communications network (e.g. Figure 1).

15. As per claim 22, Yates teaches the communications system wherein the third party servers are connected remotely to the retailer server via communications links (e.g. Figure 11).
16. As per claim 23, Yates teaches the communications system wherein the third party servers are co-located with the retailer server (e.g. Figure 1).
17. As per claim 24, Yates teaches the communications system wherein the retailer server comprises one or more servers interconnected in a network (e.g. Figure 1).
18. As per claim 25, Yates teaches the communications system wherein at least one of said plurality of third party servers comprises a plurality of servers interconnected in a network (e.g. Figure 1).
19. As per claim 26, Yates teaches the communications system wherein at least one of the user terminals comprises a mobile communications terminal (e.g. col. 3, lines 24-35).
20. As per claim 30, Yates teaches the communications system wherein said event handler comprises a cost data processor for costing a service provided by a third party during a service session (e.g. col. 16, lines 28-35).
21. As per claim 46, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above

22. As per claim 31, Yates teaches the communications system wherein said event handler comprises an event message multiplier for copying said event messages and distributing said copied messages to a plurality of event processors (e.g. col. 9, lines 1-15).

23. Claims 32-39, 50, 55, 56, and 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by "TINA Consortium - Network Resource Architecture Version 3.0 February 10, 1997" (hereinafter TINA).

24. As per claim 32, TINA teaches a session pricing manager apparatus arranged to perform a charging algorithm for a service session in a communications network, the session pricing manager apparatus being arranged to receive a plurality of event messages originating from the service session, the event messages being arranged to inform a service session manager of a predetermined set of session-related events, each event indicating at least one discrete change in the session related status of an individual participant in a session without any historical data, the session pricing manager apparatus comprising: means to filter events to discard events which are not, for the service in question, determinative of price (e.g. page 7-174, Figure 7-19); and means to copy each filtered event to a plurality of pricing engines to be logically combined in accordance with a defined charging algorithm to produce calculated price data for each participation in the session to allow a charge to be debited from an account of a responsible party for the participation (e.g. page 7-138, Figure 7-1 and page 7-140, Figure 7-2).

25. As per claim 33, TINA teaches the session pricing manager apparatus wherein the actions, or changes in status, of at least one other participation within the service session is

taken into account in the operation of the charging algorithm of the participation in question (e.g. page 7-140, paragraphs 1-4).

26. As per claim 39, Tina teaches the apparatus wherein the charges indicated for said other participants are dependent only on charges in status of the respective participants for which the billing records are produced (e.g. page 7-147, section 7.4.3).
27. As per claim 34, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
28. As per claim 35, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
29. As per claim 36, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
30. As per claim 37, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
31. As per claim 38, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
32. As per claim 50, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
33. As per claim 55, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
34. As per claim 56, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
35. As per claim 61, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Art Unit: 2152

36. Claim 27, 28, 43 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yates in view of Lynch-Aird (US 6,240,402).

37. As per claim 27, Yates does not specifically teach the communications system wherein said event handler comprises a pricing data processor for pricing a participant's usage of a service during a service session. Lynch-Aird teaches the communications system wherein said event handler comprises a pricing data processor for pricing a participant's usage of a service during a service session (e.g. col. 1, lines 23-34). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Yates with Lynch-Aird. The motivation would have been to provide a charging mechanism.

38. As per claim 43, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

39. As per claim 28, Yates does not specifically teach the communications system wherein said pricing data processor is arranged to perform service-specific processing of said event messages. Lynch-Aird teaches the communications system wherein said pricing data processor is arranged to perform service-specific processing of said event messages (e.g. col. 2, lines 44-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Yates with Lynch-Aird. The motivation would have been to provide a charging mechanism.

40. As per claim 44, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Art Unit: 2152

41. Claims 29 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yates in view of Ginzboorg et al. (US 6,047,051) (hereinafter Ginzboorg)

42. As per claim 29, Yates does not specifically teach the communications system wherein said event handler comprises a service usage monitor for storing and/or analyzing usage of said services over statistically significant numbers of service sessions. Ginzboorg teaches the communications system wherein said event handler comprises a service usage monitor for storing and/or analyzing usage of said services over statistically significant numbers of service sessions (e.g. col. 1, lines 23-35). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Yates with Ginzboorg. The motivation would have been to provide for a billing system.

43. As per claim 45, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

44. Claims 47, 52, and 54, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yates in view of TINA.

45. As per claims 47, 52, and 54, Yates does not specifically teach the event handler apparatus wherein the processor means comprises a session pricing manager arranged to operate a charging algorithm for a service session in a communications network, the session pricing manager being arranged to receive the plurality of event messages originating from the service session, the event messages being arranged to inform the service session manager of a predetermined set of session-related events, the session pricing manager comprising: means to filter received events to discard events which are not, for the service in question, determinative

Art Unit: 2152

of price; means to copy each filtered event to a plurality of pricing engines to be logically combined in accordance with a defined charging algorithm to produce calculated price data for each participation in the session to allow a charge to be debited from an account of a responsible party for the participation, wherein the actions, or changes in status, of at least one other participation within the service session is taken into account in the operation of the charging algorithm of the participation in question.

46. TINA teaches the event handler apparatus wherein the processor means comprises a session pricing manager arranged to operate a charging algorithm for a service session in a communications network, the session pricing manager being arranged to receive the plurality of event messages originating from the service session, the event messages being arranged to inform the service session manager of a predetermined set of session-related events, the session pricing manager comprising: means to filter received events to discard events which are not, for the service in question, determinative of price (e.g. page 7-174, Figure 7-19); means to copy each filtered event to a plurality of pricing engines to be logically combined in accordance with a defined charging algorithm to produce calculated price data for each participation in the session to allow a charge to be debited from an account of a responsible party for the participation, wherein the actions, or changes in status, of at least one other participation within the service session is taken into account in the operation of the charging algorithm of the participation in question (e.g. page 7-138, Figure 7-1 and page 7-140, Figure 7-2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Yates with TINA. The motivation would have been to provide for message filtering and pricing.

Art Unit: 2152

47. Applicant's arguments filed 7/14/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Therefore the rejection of claims 20-50 is maintained.

48. In the remarks, applicants argued in substance that (1), Yates fails to teach or suggest logically uncombined events; (2), Like Yates, TINA fails to teach or suggest logically uncombined events. Examiner respectfully traverses applicants' remarks.

49. As to point (1) and (2), Examiner asserts that an event message as disclosed by applicant in pages 18-19 of the specification contains: a session ID, the name of the service (or an identifier) being supplied during the session, a category of the event, the event type (start, stop, joined), a data/time stamp, a participant ID, the user name, the identity of the party to be billed. This Clearly shows that an event of the type start is associated with a date/time stamp, and another event with the type stop is associated with a date/time stamp. Each of these event messages constitutes a logical uncombined event. These event messages are the same event messages discloses by Yates and TINA.

50. Yates discloses that an information networking architecture of the type defined by TINA-C is a suitable technical context for embodiments of his invention (col. 7, lines 26-31; and col. 8, lines 29-63). Such information services infrastructure responds rapidly and at low cost, and has the attractive characteristics that it is flexible, extendible, scalable, reusable, adaptable, manageable, and robust (col. 6, line 51 to col. 7, line 9).

51. It is clearly disclosed in all available prior art about TINA-C, specially those provided by the applicant in IDS papers filed 4/13/2004, that part of the functional requirements in TINA-C (e.g. Network Resource Architecture, Version 3.0, February 1997) is the event-driven

accounting management, which is more suited approach for distributed style of management (page 142, sec. 7.3). The basis for that accounting is accountable objects, which are able to generate accountable events. The events can be directed to a metering manager to process (Page 7-148, sec. 7.4.4, page 7-149, sec. 7.4.5, page 7-152, sec. 7.5.3), see also The VITAL network Resource Architecture, by Pavon et al., page 135, sec. 3.3, which discloses that a logically uncombined event is transmitted in an event message generated in response to each change in session-related status without any historical data.

52. Yates (col. 11, lines 38-45) is defining the session concept of a context for related activities, and is defining the session as a term representing a temporal period during which activities are carried out. Yates does not disclose a period of time must be indicated in an event message. It is during the session that is managed by the session manager, the event driven accounting management is taking place, accountable objects generating accountable events, and events are directed to the metering manager to process (Page 7-148, sec. 7.4.4, page 7-149, sec. 7.4.5, page 7-152, sec. 7.5.3).

53. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2152

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

54. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nabil M. El-Hady whose telephone number is (571) 272-3963. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 - 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

September 26, 2005

N. El-Hady
Nabil El-Hady, Ph.D, M.B.A.
Primary Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2152